
From: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

To:

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc:

Bcc:

Subject: RE: Phone Call Request

Date: Mon Jan 30 2017 13:54:25 EST

Attachments:

Recommend coordinating with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for her visibility. Talk with (b)(6) and find out specifics of what the Rep. wants to discuss. We need to talk with them after we find out. Let (b)(6) know we can't talk about cost of a wall, etc... Let's touch base after you talk with (b)(6)

From: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 1:47 PM

To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Subject: FW: Phone Call Request

How do we want to handle?

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Acting Branch Chief - Border Air & Marine Operations

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Office of Congressional Affairs

Desk: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Mobile

From: (b)(6)@mail.house.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 12:28 PM

To: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6)@mail.house.gov>

Subject: Phone Call Request

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Congressman Cuellar is requesting a telephone conversation with Laredo Sector Chief Mario Martinez and Rio Grande Valley Sector Chief Manuel Padilla tomorrow between 10:00a.m. and 12:00 p.m. before the Homeland Security Appropriations hearings begin (Thursday).

He can speak with each of them individually or together.

This will be a basic appropriations discussion, i.e., what do you need to secure the border, etc.

Can you let me know ASAP?

(b) (6)

DHS Legislative Fellow

Congressman Henry Cuellar (TX-28)

2209 Rayburn House Office Building

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
(b) (6) @finance.senate.gov>
To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Trip to the "wall"
Date: Thu Jan 26 2017 11:08:12 EST
Attachments:

Are you around?

----- Original message -----

From: "LOWRY, KIM M" (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Date: 1/26/17 7:48 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: (b) (6) @finance.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: Trip to the "wall"

Ok great

From: (b) (6) (Finance)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 7:36:41 PM
To: LOWRY, KIM M
Subject: RE: Trip to the "wall"

I should be there around 9:30am. The USVI meeting is from 10-11, but I don't suspect that it should take that long.

----- Original message -----

From: "LOWRY, KIM M" (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Date: 1/25/17 6:10 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: (b) (6) @finance.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: Trip to the "wall"

Hi (b) (6)

Yes, let's talk. We have a few CODELs traveling that week....

What time will you be at the RRB?

Take care

Kim

From: [REDACTED] (b) (6) [REDACTED]@finance.senate.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 3:42 PM
To: LOWRY, KIM M [REDACTED] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Subject: Trip to the "wall"

AC Lowry,

I'm going to be over there tomorrow morning to chat about the USVI and plan on popping in if you're around, but also wanted to shoot over a quick e-mail. I was originally going to start off by saying something like "with all the talk going on about a wall," but now that it is official.

I know the "wall" doesn't fall under the jurisdiction of Finance, but because Finance has sole jurisdiction over the confirmation of the Commissioner, all the border enforcement issues will come up. Because of this, I am hoping that it would be possible to arrange a border trip during the recess week in February (the 20th through the 24th). I imagine that I'm going to start getting a lot more questions about the wall and other border security issues as President Trump's policies roll out; especially once we hear a name for the Commissioner. Since a Commissioner could be proposed at any time, I thought a trip during the first available recess would be good.

I do hope that any proposed Commissioner is as good as the new Secretary seems to be.

[REDACTED] (b) (6)

From: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

To: (b) (6)

Cc:

Bcc:

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Date: Wed Jan 25 2017 13:51:37 EST

Attachments:

Thank you (b) (6)

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 12:49 PM

To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b) (6)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Agreed. Thanks Kim.

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Acting Chief of Staff

Office of Legislative Affairs

Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6) (office)
(b) (6) (cell)

From: LOWRY, KIM M

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 12:21 PM

To: (b) (6) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Excellent. Thank you (b) (6) (b) (5)

Kim

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:54:25 AM

To: LOWRY, KIM M; (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Thanks, Kim. (b) (6) is with (b) (6) today at the NAC, so will try to speak with her shortly about the briefing request. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

Office of Legislative Affairs

Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6)

From: LOWRY, KIM M

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:50 AM

To: (b) (6) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b) (6) and I just spoke. Please send (b) (6) the CBP cleared info (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) provided. He is sending you an updated document with the same info however stripped out SAC HS Majority. This information was sent to appropriations staff last week.

(b) (5), (b) (6)

Thank you

Kim

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:31:11 AM
To: LOWRY, KIM M; (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Hi Kim,

Per our call yesterday, have you had a chance to review the HAC/SAC info in terms of providing it to HSGAC Minority in preparation for their 2/1/17 hearing? I just received the following note from (b) (6) they've spoken to Kerlikowske:

"What is the status of the questions I submitted last week? I am mainly curious about design, land acquisition and other major cost drivers (e.g. utility relocation) associated with existing fencing that were not included in the \$2.3 billion figure you initially provided. I am also particularly interested in the answer to my last question about cost-benefit analyses conducted for existing fencing and the results of those cost-benefit analyses. When can we expect a response?

Also, I wanted to again inquire about CBP leadership's availability to brief HSGAC staff on plans for the incoming administration's border wall. Could we schedule a call for tomorrow or Friday? Questions will likely focus on project scope, anticipated costs, plans for payment from Mexico and any cost-benefit analysis that will be conducted prior to construction.

Outgoing CBP Commissioner Gil Kerlikowske told us yesterday that Acting Commissioner Kevin McAleenan would have access to previous cost-benefit analyses in his previous role as Deputy Commissioner. So it might be helpful to have Acting Commissioner McAleenan on the call if his schedule allows.

I believe we are available all day tomorrow, with the exception of 2:30 to 3:30 p.m., and any time after 2 p.m. Friday. Realistically, we will need to hear from you by COB Friday in order to incorporate the information you provide in materials for the Feb. 1 hearing that has been noticed."

(b) (6)

Can you please share the above with (b) (6) and get her thoughts?

Thanks,

(b) (6)

Office of Legislative Affairs

Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6)

From: LOWRY, KIM M

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:50 AM

To: (b) (6) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b) (6)

I think it would be helpful if we have a phone call this afternoon OLA and CBP OCA to discuss way forward....

How does 3 pm work?

Thanks,

Kim

Kim M. Lowry

Acting Assistant Commissioner

Office of Congressional Affairs

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:17 AM
To: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Hi (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Any word yet from your leadership?

Thanks,

(b) (6)

Office of Legislative Affairs

Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6)

From: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 4:03 PM
To: (b) (6) LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b) (6)

Hold on transmission for now: we're going to have a conversation with CBP leadership. Will follow up shortly.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Acting Branch Chief - Border Air & Marine Operations

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Office of Congressional Affairs

Desk: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Mobile

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 3:49 PM

To: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

I was getting ready to send this info over to (b) (6) and I received a call from him (literally after we got off the phone). He is interested in doing a staff level brief on this topic prior to the 2/1/17 hearing. How would you like to proceed with that request and would you still like me to send this cleared information over, or would it be better to wrap it up in a possible briefing?

Thanks,

(b) (6)

Office of Legislative Affairs

Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6)

From: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 10:13 AM

To: (b) (6) LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b) (6)

As discussed: please see below and attached. This information was shared with SAC-HS and should answer a number of (b) (6) questions. Responses # 8 & #10 answer a lot of his bullet points.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

The averages should not be applied to the total 654 mileage of fencing – legacy fencing average costs are not available – which makes up 65 miles of pedestrian fencing and 73 miles of vehicle fencing (138 total miles). Below are the major projects – “PF 70”, “PF 225” and “VF 300” with the associated ROMs that back into the approximate \$2.3 billion referenced. These averages do not include the acquisition of real estate or labor.

Project Name

Description

ROM

Total (000s)

PF 70

78 miles built (w/ BSFIT)

\$6.5M / mile

\$507,000

PF 225

211 miles built (w/ BSFIT)

\$6.5M / mile

\$1,371,500

VF 300

227 miles built (w/ BSFIT)

\$1.8M / mile

\$408,600

Total

516 miles

\$2,287,100

Legacy Fence

138 miles (PF=65 mi; VF = 73 mi)

Average costs are not available

654 primary fence miles

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Acting Branch Chief - Border Air & Marine Operations

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Office of Congressional Affairs

Desk: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Mobile

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 4:05 PM

To: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

I shared the info from your email below with (b) (6) and he came back with the following questions:

- What is included in the \$1.9 billion price tag for pedestrian fencing? For instance, does that figure include design and land acquisition costs? Or just construction?
- If \$1.9 billion just includes construction costs, can you please provide figures for design, land acquisition and other major cost drivers?
- How much land had to be acquired for the 354 miles of pedestrian fencing you reference? From how many property owners did that land have to be acquired?
- Can you provide a general timeline for when the pedestrian – and other – fencing was installed?
- I'm confused about how you arrived at the \$6.5 million per mile figure for pedestrian fencing. If I multiple \$6.5 million by 354 miles of pedestrian fencing, I get a grand total of approximately \$2.3 billion. What am I missing?
- You refer to "bollard style" fencing in your response. Forgive my ignorance, but is "bollard style" fencing synonymous with "pedestrian" fencing?
- Am I correct in assuming that the remaining 298.6 miles of non-pedestrian fencing is "vehicle" fencing?
- Given that the total cost of building 652.6 miles of fencing was approximately \$2.3 billion and the cost for 354 miles of pedestrian fencing was approximately \$1.9 billion, was the cost of the remaining 298.6 miles of non-pedestrian fencing approximately \$400 million (or roughly \$1.3 million per mile)?

*Has all of the \$2.3 billion spent on fencing been directed to the Army Corps of Engineers, to contractors working on behalf of the Corps of Engineers, or to contractors directly?

*Assuming contractors have been involved: Is/Are there one or two contractors that have performed the lion's share of the work? If so, who are they? How much were they paid? And when?

*What cost-benefit analysis has CBP conducted on various border security measures (e.g. walls, fencing, sensors, patrols, aerostats, drones, manned aircraft, etc.), and what were the results of those cost-benefit analyses? Can you send documentation on the efficiency and effectiveness of different types of border security measures?

It appears (b) (6) is seeking the additional information in advance of the tentative HSGAC hearing in February.

Why don't we chat on Monday? Just let me know a good time to give you a call.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

From: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 11:01 AM

To: (b) (6) LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b) (6)

As requested:

This was the 11/30 hearing responses we sent to HSGAC:

*354 miles of pedestrian fencing completed. Cost: Approximately \$1.9 billion

*Average cost per mile: Approximately \$6.5 million for pedestrian fence

*Annual cost to maintain 354 miles of pedestrian fencing:

*On average, CBP spends approximately \$12 million per year to maintain and repair pedestrian and vehicle fence. On average, CBP spends \$50-55 million annually to maintain and repair all owned tactical infrastructure. These costs include, in addition to the maintenance and repair of fence,

maintenance and repair of gates, boat ramps, thousands of miles of roads with associated bridges, light posts, hundreds of drainage systems and grates, thousands of acres of vegetation and debris removal and other infrastructure.

*Bollard style fencing is approximately (b) (7)(E)

And this is what we've publicly testified on:

From May 13 HSGAC Testimony: <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2015/05/13/written-testimony-cbp-senate-committee-homeland-security-and-governmental-affairs>

"The total cost to build fence in place (652.6 miles) is approximately \$2.3 billion. CBP was allocated approximately \$49 million in Fiscal Year 2015 to maintain and repair fence and gates, roads and bridges, lights, and other TI. This total only includes Border Patrol's prioritized TI maintenance and repair requirements. This level of funding for maintenance and repair of TI requirements was also part of the FY 2016 budget request."

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Acting Branch Chief - Border Air & Marine Operations

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Office of Congressional Affairs

Desk: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Mobile

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 4:50 PM

To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

Subject: FW: Border Wall Briefing

Hi Kim and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

I spoke with (b) (6) and he understands not getting ahead of the new Administration. He would like,

however, the general information about the current fence that we have provided to other staff. Is this something you can share with me in writing to pass to (b) (6) or would you prefer to have a quick call with him?

Thanks,

(b) (6)

Office of Legislative Affairs

Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6)

From: LOWRY, KIM M
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 5:49:30 PM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b) (6) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

No worries! Thank you so much and have a wonderful weekend all!

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 5:45 PM
To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b) (6)
(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

Sorry about that oversight. I agree with you, Kim. We'll go back to (b) (6) with that suggestion and will keep you and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) posted. Thanks!

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Director | Office of Legislative Affairs

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6) (o) | (b) (6) (m)

From: LOWRY, KIM M

Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 5:09 PM

To: (b) (6)

Cc: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b) (6)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Wall Briefing

(b) (6)

Including (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) since this issue falls on his team.

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Does this make sense?....let me know if we can help in any other way.

Thanks

Kim

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 4:10 PM

To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b) (6)

Subject: FW: Border Wall Briefing

Kim:

HSGAC minority is requesting a briefing next week on fencing along the SWB and plans for a possible wall. How would you like to handle?

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Director | Office of Legislative Affairs

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

(b) (6) (o) | (b) (6) (m)

From: (b) (6)@hsgac.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 1:41 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: Border Wall Briefing

Good afternoon (b) (6)

(b) (6) here with the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

I'm writing to request a staff briefing, if possible, with members of CBP/Border Patrol's current administration regarding plans for a wall or additional fencing along the SW border. This would be a general overview of what exists currently, how that comports with the Secure Fence Act of 2006 and what conversations/requests for information you've had from the incoming administration.

Apologies, as I realize this conversation would need to happen in short order. Would you -- and members of the CBP team -- be available to brief me -- and other HSGAC staffers -- sometime next week? Wednesday outside of noon to 2 p.m. or Thursday would be preferable.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Verizon Wireless 4G LTE network.

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) >
To: MORGAN, MARK A (USBP)
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
>
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Fence
Date: Tue Jan 24 2017 15:20:50 EST
Attachments:

Thank you

From: MORGAN, MARK A (USBP)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:57:32 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Subject: FW: Fence

Sir,

FYSA. (b) (5)

Mark

From: (b) (6) @mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:24 PM
To: MORGAN, MARK A (USBP) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Re: Fence

Call you tomorrow

On Jan 24, 2017, at 12:50 PM, MORGAN, MARK A (USBP) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wrote:
That should work. My number is (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:35:15 AM
To: MORGAN, MARK A (USBP)
Subject: RE: Fence

Tomorrow at 0930?

From: MORGAN, MARK A (USBP) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:24 AM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Fence

Yes. Any time.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:10:45 AM
To: MORGAN, MARK A (USBP)
Subject: Fence

Have time to chat? When can you brief me on the fence plan?